UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,008	08/26/2003	Gordon Short	SFTO0001	5928

			EXAMINER
22862	7590	03/08/2006	PYO, MONICA M

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/649,008	SHORT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Monica M. Pyo	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 August 2003_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _8/10/04_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-36 are present for examination.

2.   Claims 1-36 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 08/10/2004 was filed.

Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 1-13, 14, 19-31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claims 1, 14, 19 and 32, the phrase "and/or" condition renders the claim

indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the

claimed invention. Claims 2-13, 20-31 are also rejected by virtue of their dependency to Claims

1 and 19.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 1-8, 14-15, 19-26, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,829,613 issued to Liddy (hereafter Liddy) and in view of

U.S. Patent No. 6,006,221 issued to Liddy et al. (hereafter Paik).

<u>Claims 1 & 19</u>:

Regarding Claim 1, Liddy discloses a process for real time analysis of text and/or media

content and relating information to the content, comprising the steps of:

- analyzing said content in real time (Liddy: col, 5, lns. 46-56; col. 10, lns. 35-53;

  figs. 3 & 6);

- wherein said analyzing step analyzes said content for semantic and conceptual use

  (Liddy: col. 10, lns. 54-65; fig. 6);

- providing a set of informational documents (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-66; fig. 3);

- wherein said informational documents comprise any of text, Web, and media

  documents (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 50-67; col. 6, lns. 1-4; fig. 3);

- providing a analysis of said informational documents (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 15-26;

  fig.4);

- wherein said analysis is an analysis of said informational documents for semantic

  and conceptual use (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; fig.4)

- identifying informational documents related to said analyzed content using said

  analysis (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-20);

- providing a user with a description of each identified informational document

  (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 20-38 – Liddy references to already existing "KNOW-IT"

  system developed by 'Textwise LLC of Syracuse".);

Liddy does not specifically discloses:

- pre-processed analysis

- accepting user input for selecting an identified informational document; and

- displaying the selected identified informational document to the user

However, Paik discloses:

- pre-processed analysis (Paik: col. 8, lns. 40-53)

- accepting user input for selecting an identified informational document (Paik: col.

  6, lns. 37-43); and

- displaying the selected identified informational document to the user (Paik: col. 6,

  lns. 43-47).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine this document retrieval system of Paik into the technique for controlling

the information distribution of Liddy to utilize the translation of similar words. Skilled artisan

would have been motivated to incorporate the Paik's teaching of document retrieval system in

the Liddy's controlling the information distribution system to enter a query and retrieve

document from a database, as suggested by Paik, which discloses "Documents are matched to queries based on the conceptual-level contents of the document and query, and, optionally, on the basis of the term-based representation" (Paik: see Abstract).

Claim 19 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 1.

Claims 2 & 20:

Regarding Claim 2, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 1, *supra*. Additionally, Liddy in view of Paik discloses: wherein said identifying step identifies related informational documents by finding informational documents that are similar in words, semantically or conceptually, to the analyzed content (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; col. 7, lns. 28-38; col. 9, lns. 51-58; col. 10, lns. 54-65; fig. 6) & (Paik: col. 5, lns. 65-67; col. 6, lns. 1-12).

Claim 20 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 2.

Claims 3 & 21:

Regarding Claim 3, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 1, *supra*. Additionally, Liddy discloses: further comprising the step of:

- storing descriptors for each informational document (Liddy: col. 11, lns. 25-45 – Liddy discloses Natural Language Processing Information Retrieval (NLPIR) system).

- retrieving descriptions of each identified informational document from said stored descriptors (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-38)

Claim 21 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 3.

Claims 4 & 22:

Regarding Claim 4, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 1, *supra*.

Additionally, Liddy discloses: wherein said set of informational documents are stored in a central

storage device (Liddy: col. 11, lns. 34-57; fig. 6).

Claim 22 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 4.

Claims 5 & 23:

Regarding Claim 5, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 1, *supra*.

Additionally, Liddy in view of Paik discloses: wherein said pre-processed analysis creates a list

of words and calculates the frequency that the words appear in said set of informational

documents (Liddy: col. 8, lns. 41-67; col. 9, lns. 1-11) & (Paik: col. 6, lns. 52-63).

Claim 23 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 5.

Claims 6 & 24:

Regarding Claim 6, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 5, *supra*.

Additionally, Liddy in view of Paik discloses: wherein said pre-processed analysis translates

similar words into the same word (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 15-26; fig.4) & (Paik: col. 21, lns. 60-67;

col. 22, lns. 1-14).

Claim 24 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 6.

Claims 7 & 25:

Regarding Claim 7, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 1, *supra*.

Additionally, Liddy in view of Paik discloses: wherein said pre-processed analysis generates

collocations of words that appear together and calculates the frequency of pairs of words and the

frequency of the words appearing together in said informational documents (Liddy: col. 9, lns. 1-

11) & (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53 & 59-67; col. 11, lns. 7-24).

Claim 25 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 7.

Claims 8 & 26:

Regarding Claim 8, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 7, *supra*.

Additionally, Paik discloses: wherein said pre-processed analysis finds relations between

collocations to learn their meaning/context (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-50; col. 11, lns. 7-26;).

Claim 26 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 8.

Claims 14 & 32:

Regarding Claim 14, Liddy discloses a process for real time analysis of text and/or media

content in a workflow application and relating information to the content, comprising the steps

of:

- automatically analyzing said content in real time as said content is being entered

  or reviewed by a user (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-56; col. 10, lns. 35-53; col. 11, lns.

  58-65) ;

- wherein said analyzing step analyzes said content for semantic and conceptual use

  (Liddy: col. 10, lns. 54-65; fig. 6);

- providing a set of informational documents (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-66; fig. 3);

- wherein said informational documents comprise any of text, Web, and media

  documents (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 50-67; col. 6, lns. 1-4; fig. 3);

- providing a pre-processed analysis of said informational documents (Liddy: col.

  6, lns. 15-26; fig.4);

- wherein said pre-processed analysis is an analysis of said informational

  documents for semantic and conceptual use (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; fig.4);

-       identifying informational documents related to said analyzed content using said

        pre-processed analysis (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-20);

-       wherein said identifying step identifies related informational documents by

        finding informational documents that are similar in words, semantically or

        conceptually, to the analyzed content (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; col. 7, lns. 28-38;

        col. 9, lns. 51-58);

-       providing a user with a description of each identified informational document

        (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 20-36);

Liddy does not specifically discloses:

-       pre-processed analysis

-       accepting user input for selecting an identified informational document; and

-       displaying the selected identified informational document to the user.

On the other hand, Paik discloses:

-       pre-processed analysis (Paik: col. 8, lns. 40-53)

-       accepting user input for selecting an identified informational document (Paik: col.

        6, lns. 37-43); and

-       displaying the selected identified informational document to the user (Paik: col. 6,

        lns. 43-47).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine this document retrieval system of Paik into the technique for controlling

the information distribution of Liddy to utilize the translation of similar words. Skilled artisan

would have been motivated to incorporate the Paik's teaching of document retrieval system in

the Liddy's controlling the information distribution system to enter a query and retrieve

document from a database, as suggested by Paik, which discloses "Documents are matched to

queries based on the conceptual-level contents of the document and query, and, optionally, on

the basis of the term-based representation" (Paik: see Abstract).

Claim 32 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 14.

Claims 15 & 33:

Regarding Claim 15, Liddy discloses a process for real time analysis of text and/or media

content and relating information to the content, comprising the steps of:

- extracting metadata from said media content in real time as said content is being

  viewed by a user (Liddy: col. 10, lns. 35-53; col. 11, lns. 66-67; col. 12, lns. 1-34;

  fig. 6);

- providing a set of informational documents (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 46-66; fig. 3);

- wherein said informational documents comprise any of text, Web, and media

  documents (Liddy: col. 5, lns. 50-67; col. 6, lns. 1-4; fig. 3);

- providing a analysis of said informational documents (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 15-26;

  fig.4);

- wherein said analysis is an analysis of said informational documents for semantic

  and conceptual use (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; fig.4)

- identifying informational documents related to said analyzed content using said

  analysis (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-20);

- wherein said identifying step identifies related information documents by finding

  informational documents that are similar in words, semantically or conceptually

to said metada (Liddy: col. 6, lns. 53-65; col. 7, lns. 28-38; col. 9, lns. 51-58; col.

10, lns. 54-65; col. 12, lns. 1-16);

- providing a user with a description of each identified informational document

    (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 20-38 – Liddy references to already existing "KNOW-IT"

    system developed by 'Textwise LLC of Syracuse".);

Liddy does not specifically discloses:

- pre-processed analysis

- accepting user input for selecting an identified informational document; and

- displaying the selected identified informational document to the user

However, Paik discloses:

- pre-processed analysis (Paik: col. 8, lns. 40-53)

- accepting user input for selecting an identified informational document (Paik: col.

    6, lns. 37-43); and

- displaying the selected identified informational document to the user (Paik: col. 6,

    lns. 43-47).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine this document retrieval system of Paik into the technique for controlling

the information distribution of Liddy to utilize the translation of similar words. Skilled artisan

would have been motivated to incorporate the Paik's teaching of document retrieval system in

the Liddy's controlling the information distribution system to enter a query and retrieve

document from a database, as suggested by Paik, which discloses "Documents are matched to

queries based on the conceptual-level contents of the document and query, and, optionally, on

the basis of the term-based representation" (Paik: see Abstract).

Claim 33 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 1.

6.   Claims 9-12 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Liddy in view of Paik as applied to claims 1-8, 14-15, 19-26, 32 and 33 above, and further in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,367 issued to Ayyadurai (hereafter Ayyadurai).

Claims 9 & 27:

Regarding Claim 9, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 1, *supra*.

Additionally, Liddy in view of Paik discloses: wherein said pre-processed analysis uses wherein

a vector of words and their weighting within an informational document; wherein the weighting

is determined by the importance of a word in the collocations and within the document (Paik:

col. 8, lns. 42-53; col. 15, lns. 3-17).

Liddy in view of Paik do not disclose: a signature algorithm to calculate signatures for

blocks of text,

However, Ayyadurai discloses: a signature algorithm to calculate signatures for blocks of

text (Ayyadurai: col. 4, lns. 27-43; fig. 1),

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine this signature block of Ayyadurai into the document retrieval system of

Paik and the technique for controlling the information distribution of Liddy to utilize stream

analysis for broadcast information. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the

Ayyadurai's teaching of utilizing the signature block of text in the Paik's document retrieval

system and the Liddy's controlling the information distribution system to find practical use of an

automated system email and text based messages, as suggested by Ayyadurai, which discloses

"allow a user to review the initial characterization and classification of individual messages

through a user interface" (Ayyadurai: col. 3, lns. 47-63).

Claim 27 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 9.

Claims 10 & 28:

Regarding Claim 10, Liddy in view of Paik and Ayyadurai discloses all the limitation of

Claim 9, *supra*. Additionally, Liddy, Paik and Ayyadurai disclose: wherein said pre-processed

analysis calculates signatures for Web pages, text tags associated with images, and blocks of text

(Liddy: col. 11, lns. 26-45), (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53) & (Ayyadurai: col. 4, lns. 27-43; fig. 1).

Claim 28 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 10.

Claims 11 & 29:

Regarding Claim 11, Liddy in view of Paik and Ayyadurai discloses all the limitation of

Claim 9, *supra*. Additionally, Liddy, Paik and Ayyadurai disclose: wherein said pre-processed

analysis creates an index for each word from a signature vector for an informational document

and saves the index, word, text document, and weight of the word into a database that is used to

find text documents that have similar signatures (Liddy: col. 11, lns. 26-45 & 66-67; col. 12, lns.

1-16), (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53; col. 15, lns. 3-17) & (Ayyadurai: col. 4, lns. 27-43; fig. 1).

Claim 29 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 11.

Claims 12 & 30:

Regarding Claim 12, Liddy in view of Paik and Ayyadurai discloses all the limitation of

Claim 9, *supra*. Additionally, Paik and Ayyadurai disclose: wherein said pre-processed analysis

uses the signatures and weights of the words to create sets of documents that have similar

signatures (Paik: col. 8, lns. 42-53; col. 15, lns. 3-17) & (Ayyadurai: col. 4, lns. 27-43; fig. 1) .

Claim 30 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 12.

7.   Claims 13, 16-18, 31 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Liddy in view of Paik as applied to claims 1-8, 14-15, 19-26, 32 and 33 above,

and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,858 issued to Coden et al. (hereafter Coden).

Claims 13 & 31:

Regarding Claim 13, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 1, *supra*.

Additionally, Liddy in view of Paik discloses: further comprising the step of: collecting text

documents from Web pages across the Internet using a Web crawler and placing them into said

set of informational documents (Liddy: col. 3, lns. 66-67; col. 4, lns. 1-19; col. 7, lns. 51-60) &

(Paik: col. 11, lns. 7-24; col. 13, lns. 42-47).

Liddy in view of Paik do not disclose: and multimedia

However, Coden discloses: and multimedia (Coden: col. 11, lns. 8-25).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine this providing collateral information for a video and audio system of Coden

into the document retrieval system of Paik and the technique for controlling the information

distribution of Liddy to utilize stream analysis for broadcast information. Skilled artisan would

have been motivated to incorporate the Coden's teaching of collateral information for a video

and audio system in the Paik's document retrieval system and the Liddy's controlling the

information distribution system to fully operate in real-time and add relevant collateral

information to live programming, as suggested by Coden, which discloses "The system is fully automatic and operates in real time, allowing broadcasters to add relevant collateral information to live programming" (Coden: see Abstract).

Claim 31 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 13.

Claims 16 & 34:

Regarding Claim 16, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 15, *supra*. Additionally, Liddy in view of Paik discloses: specifies their relevance to be used said identifying step (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-20) & (Paik: col. 7, lns. 48-56).

Liddy in view of Paik do not disclose: wherein a broadcaster provides customized informational documents and.

However, Coden discloses: wherein a broadcaster provides customized informational documents and (Coden: col. 3, lns. 1-13; col. 6, lns. 13-33);

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine this providing collateral information for a video and audio system of Coden into the document retrieval system of Paik and the technique for controlling the information distribution of Liddy to utilize stream analysis for broadcast information. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the Coden's teaching of collateral information for a video and audio system in the Paik's document retrieval system and the Liddy's controlling the information distribution system to fully operate in real-time and add relevant collateral information to live programming, as suggested by Coden, which discloses "The system is fully automatic and operates in real time, allowing broadcasters to add relevant collateral information to live programming" (Coden: see Abstract).

Claim 34 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 16.

Claims 17 & 35:

Regarding Claim 17, Liddy in view Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 15, *supra*.

Additionally, Liddy, Paik and Coden discloses: wherein a producer of said media content

provides customized informational documents and specifies their relevance to be used by said

identifying step (Liddy: col. 7, lns. 5-20), (Paik: col. 7, lns. 48-56) & (Coden: col. 3, lns. 1-13 &

39-45; col. 6, lns. 13-23).

Claim 35 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 17.

Claims 18 & 36:

Regarding Claim 18, Liddy in view of Paik discloses all the limitation of Claim 15,

supra. Additionally, Liddy and Coden discloses: wherein said extracting step creates metadata

for said media content by analyzing said media content if said media content does not have

associated in-band metadata (Liddy: col. 10, lns. 35-53; col. 11, lns. 66-67; col. 12, lns. 1-34; fig.

6) & (Coden: col. 6, lns. 13-23).

Claim 36 is also rejected based upon the same reasoning as Claim 18.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Monica M. Pyo whose telephone number is 571-272-8192. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Monica M Pyo
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

2/28/2006

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BG